

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 31, 2006. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 15 to 17, 20, 25, 32, 33, 39, and 45 are in the application, with Claims 3, 5 to 9, 11 to 14, 18, 19, 21, 26 to 28, 31, 34 to 38, 40 to 44, and 46 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 33, and 39 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 7, 10 to 14, 18 to 21 and 23 to 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,686,954 (Yoshinobu) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,813,775 (Finseth). Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshinobu in view of Finseth and U.S. Patent No. 5,758,259 (Lawler). Claims 13, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshinobu in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0231003 (Cooper). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshinobu in view of Finseth, Cooper, and U.S. Patent No. 6,642,939 (Vallone). Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Yoshinobu in view of Finseth, Cooper, and U.S. Patent No. 6,002,394 (Schein). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Turning first to the rejections of Claims 13 to 18, the Office Action asserts that the sworn translation of priority application Japan 11-344565, which Applicants filed on July 24, 2006, lacks support for Claims 13 and 14. Without conceding the correctness of the Office Action's assertion, Claims 13, 14 and 18 have been cancelled, and amendments to Claims 15 to 17 are believe to obviate the rejections.

Now referring to the specific language of the claims, independent Claim 1 defines a receiving apparatus comprising a receiving unit for receiving a television broadcasting signal in which video signals of a plurality of broadcasting programs and program guide information of the plurality of broadcasting programs are multiplexed, an extraction unit for extracting the program guide information from the television broadcasting signal received by the receiving unit, and a selecting unit for selecting, by a user using a first program guide table based on the program guide information extracted by the extracting unit, a program corresponding to first program information from the plurality of programs. The apparatus also comprises an input unit for inputting by the user, second program information regarding the selected program, including a recommendation index indicating a recommendation degree, an integrating unit for integrating the first and second program information, and a transmitting unit for transmitting the integrated program information as recommendation guide information to an external apparatus, which is accessible by another user. The apparatus also comprises a program table generating unit for generating a second program table in accordance with recommendation guide information including a recommendation index transmitted by another user.

Independent Claims 33 and 39 define a method and a recording medium storing a program, respectively, that correspond generally to the apparatus of Claim 1.

The applied references are not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 1, 33 and 39, and in particular, are not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of inputting by a user, second program information regarding a selected program, including a recommendation index indicating a recommendation degree, and

generating a second program table in accordance with recommendation guide information including a recommendation index transmitted by another user.

Finseth is seen to disclose a system of sharing viewing preferences in which a user can input specific comments or reviews using a remote control or infrared keyboard. (See, column 12, lines 35 to 38 of Finseth). Finseth is also seen to disclose “to build a program guide that displays programs that other users would find interesting”. (column 13, lines 22 to 23). However, Finseth is not seen to disclose or to suggest inputting by a user, second program information regarding a selected program, including a recommendation index indicating a recommendation degree, and generating a second program table in accordance with recommendation guide information including a recommendation index transmitted by another user.

The remaining applied references, namely Yoshinobu, Lawler, Cooper, Vallone, and Schein, are not seen to cure the deficiencies of Finseth, either alone or in any permissible combination. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 33 and 39 are believed to be allowable.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Turning to a formal matter, the Office Action indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) filed on February 5, 2001 is considered missing. However,

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to the Patent Office's Image File Wrapper, in which a copy of the IDS as filed, as well as a copy of U.S. Application No. 09/531,959 filed with the IDS, are readily available.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gregory S. Weaver/  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 53,751

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200